

### **REMARKS**

In the above-mentioned Office Action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-2, 4, 8-9, 11, and 15-18 were rejected. Each of the claims was rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Rune and Sarkkinen.

In response to the rejection of the claims, the independent claims have been amended, as set forth herein, in manners believed better to distinguish the invention of the present application over the cited combination. With respect to exemplary claim 1, the claim has been amended, now to recite the clearing from the user equipment of any record of a cell identifier that at least temporarily identifies a cell. Independent claims 8 and 16 were analogously amended.

Support for the proposed amendments is found in the specification, e.g., on page 3, lines 8-11, page 8, line 1, page 9, line 2, page 9 line 22, page 10, lines 11-12, and page 11, lines 7-8.

To the extent that the Examiner asserts that the claims, as now-amended, are obvious in light of the cited combination, such assertion is respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relied upon paragraphs [0023-0027], [0036-0038], and [0063-0069] of Rune for showing the clearing from a device any record of a cell identifier before moving to a dedicated channel state. Review of these sections of Rune, however, fail to show the clearing of a cell identifier that at least temporarily identifies a cell. Specific reference is made to paragraph 67 of Rune. Paragraph [0067] of Rune makes reference to a cell being regarded as best by the network as the primary or secondary cell that is decided by the UE and signaled to the network. Neither this section, nor others, of the reference refer to the clearing of a temporary, or other, cell identifier in response to reception of a message indicating that a user equipment should be moved into

a dedicated channel state. And, more particularly, there is no disclosure of the clearing of a temporary, or other, identifier in response to reception of a cell update confirm message, a URA Update Confirm message, or an RRC Connection Setup message, all as recited in the independent claims.

Sarkkinen was cited for showing the sending of a response message receivable by a network after a UE is cleared of any record of a cell identifier. While paragraph 41 of Sarkkinen makes reference to a TMSI, its mention is made with respect to a multicast record located at a network database. While paragraph [0041] further states that the cleaning of a record can be made based upon an identification of a UE, such operation would necessarily be carried out the network, and not at the UE. In this regard, reference is made to paragraph [0077] and the disclosure therein of cleaning and updating of a multicast database subsequent to the sending by the UE of a multicast area update message and its reception at a radio network controller.

Additional note is made with respect to claim 18. Rejection of this claim is additionally traversed for the reason that neither of the cited references discloses a cell radio network temporary identifier.

Claim 18, as well as others of the dependent claims, includes all of the recitations of their respective parent claims. These claims are believed to be distinguishable over the cited combination of references for the same reasons as those given with respect to their parent claims.

In light of the foregoing, independent claims 1, 8, and 16, as now-amended, and the dependent claims dependent thereon are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/673,810  
Amendment dated October 2, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of July 3, 2008

Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

---

Robert H. Kelly  
Registration No. 33,922

KELLY & KRAUSE, L.P.  
6600 LBJ Freeway, Suite 275  
Dallas, Texas 75240  
Telephone: (214) 446-6684  
Fax: (214) 446-6692  
[robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com](mailto:robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com)